

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/875,151	06/07/2001	Toshifumi Sato	Q64872	7262	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037			EXAMINER BURD, KEVIN MICHAEL		
			2631		
					DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/875,151	SATO, TOSHIFUMI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kevin M. Burd	2631		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Kevin M. Burd	2631						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 06 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because								
<ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul>								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for								
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	elected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b) ☐ wovided below or appended.	vill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4</u> .								
Claim(s) rejected. 1-4. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at	out before or on the date of filing a l and sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence	not be entered is necessary					
and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	a a Notice of Appeal, but prior to th	e date of filing a brief	will not be					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.								
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ance hecause:					
See Continuation Sheet.			ince because.					
<ul><li>12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)</li><li>13. Other:</li></ul>		MAN MAN MAN MAN KEVIN BURD PRIMARY EXAMIN	d ER					
		PRIMAKY EARIN'						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Kanda discloses preceding data supplied from the frame memory are input to the determining circuit (column 6, lines 7-11 and lines 12-46). Therefore, Kanda manipulates correlation coefficients already calculated. In addition, Applicant states Kanda fails to disclose the specific features of the claimed differential detector where only the "real parts" of the coefficients are output. However, the limitation of "only the real parts of the coefficients are output" is not recited in the claims.